

096016

~~4.14.83~~

~~74-0476~~

096016



Opportunities For Increased Interservice Use Of Training Programs And Resources

B-175773

Department of Defense

**UNITED STATES
GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE**

~~701776~~

096016

NOV. 27, 1973



UNITED STATES GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20548

FEDERAL PERSONNEL AND
COMPENSATION DIVISION

B-175773

The Honorable
The Secretary of Defense 5

Dear Mr. Secretary:

This is our report on opportunities for increased interservice use of training programs and resources in the Department of Defense. J

We are sending copies of this report to the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force; the Director, Office of Management and Budget; and the Chairmen, House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, Armed Services, and Government Operations.

> 00300
> 00500
> 01000

Sincerely yours,

Forrest R. Browne

Forrest R. Browne
Director

C o n t e n t s

		<u>Page</u>
DIGEST		1
CHAPTER		
1	INTRODUCTION	3
2	INTERSERVICE USE OF TRAINING PROGRAMS AND RESOURCES CAN BE INCREASED	5
	Limited efforts made to promote interservice training	5
	Potential to increase interservice training	7
3	JOINT REVIEW INITIATED TO IDENTIFY INTER- SERVICE TRAINING OPPORTUNITIES	10
	Background and objectives	10
	Review effort status	10
	Steps taken to insure continuing the review	13
	OSD role in interservice training review	14
4	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	15
	Conclusions	15
	Recommendations	16
5	SCOPE OF REVIEW	17
APPENDIX		
	Locations visited	19

ABBREVIATIONS

DOD	Department of Defense
GAO	General Accounting Office
JCS	Joint Chiefs of Staff
OSD	Office of the Secretary of Defense

D I G E S T

WHY THE REVIEW WAS MADE

(The Department of Defense (DOD) spends more than \$6 billion annually to train personnel in a variety of occupational specialties. In recent years the Congress has expressed considerable interest in DOD's expenditures for training and, in particular, in economies and efficiencies obtainable through consolidating common DOD training requirements.

Because of the significant expenditures involved and the congressional interest in training, GAO reviewed DOD's attempts to insure maximum interservice use of training programs and resources.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

DOD has long recognized the benefits of interservice training arrangements for more effective, efficient, and economical use of its training programs and resources. Before GAO's review, DOD had not aggressively promoted it. Although there were some interservice training arrangements, the amount represented only about 6 percent of the total training in DOD. (See p. 6.)

Interservice training has not been extensive up to now because each military service has decided how its training requirements could best be met within its resources. Although required by their regulations, the

services generally had not

- reviewed existing training courses of other services for possible duplication,
- examined other services' training programs before establishing new training or when effecting major revisions to existing training, and
- initiated joint studies to determine the feasibility of adapting existing education and training programs to interservice use. (See p. 6.)

Neither the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) nor the services' headquarters had assessed efforts by the training commands to promote interservice training. (See p. 6.)

To determine whether opportunities existed in DOD to increase the use of interservice training, GAO selected seven technical and five medical occupational specialties (skills) and reviewed the training being provided separately by the services. GAO found that training requirements were sufficiently similar in each of the 12 skills to indicate that personnel of 2 or more services could be trained on an interservice basis. (See p. 8.)

GAO issued an interim report to the Secretary of Defense in May 1972. Following this report and because of

congressional interest, in September 1972 the services began a joint review of training programs and resources to identify interservice training opportunities. This review represents the services' first attempt at a comprehensive and continuing analysis of interservice training opportunities. Their preliminary work identified a number of interservice training opportunities. (See p. 10.)

OSD has been excluded from the joint meetings and has not established its role in promoting interservice training. However, the services have provided OSD with periodic progress reports on their activities. (See p. 14.)

GAO believes that DOD can achieve significant economies and efficiencies by expanding its use of interservice training programs and resources. Identifying such opportunities, however, will require a continuing analysis of training programs and resources. Although the precise benefits cannot be ascertained until such an analysis is made, the fact that only a 5-percent reduction in DOD's annual training cost of over \$6 billion would amount to annual savings of over \$300 million illustrates how significant the benefits might be. (See p. 15.)

GAO considers it significant that

the services have recognized and responded to the need for a comprehensive and continuing review of interservice training opportunities. Although it is too early to assess the results, the prospects for meaningful progress are encouraging because of the apparent willingness of the services to relinquish parochial interests and to join in a concerted effort to promote interservice training. The results, thus far, substantiate GAO's belief that the benefits will be significant. (See p. 15.)

RECOMMENDATIONS OR SUGGESTIONS

GAO recommends that the Secretary of Defense, by directive or other appropriate means, establish an OSD role in interservice training to insure that:

- All existing and future interservice training opportunities are recognized and acted on.
- There is a continuing requirement for a joint review of training programs and resources. (See p. 16.)

GAO recommends also that the Secretary monitor this review closely to observe that the respective services continue their cooperative efforts to promote greater use of interservice training programs. (See p. 16.)

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

One of the most important peacetime activities of the Department of Defense (DOD) is personnel training and education, for which it spends more than \$6 billion annually. We reviewed DOD's attempts to seek and act on opportunities for economies and efficiencies obtainable through interservice use of training programs and resources.

The Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) is responsible for coordinating and integrating DOD training policies and programs. The Secretaries of the military services have overall management responsibility for education and training in their respective services.

The principal service organizations responsible for training are the Air Force's Air Training Command, the Navy's Naval Training Command, the Army's Training and Doctrine Command, and the Training and Education Branch and Technical Manpower Requirements Branch, Marine Corps Headquarters.

Training personnel for medical specialties is under the direction of the Air Force, Navy, and Army Surgeon Generals. The Marine Corps receives medical and dental services from the Navy and conducts no such training of its own.

DOD has thousands of training courses available in several hundred occupational specialties (skills). Some existing training courses, though developed and administered by one military service, are sometimes used by other services to fulfill common requirements for training. Also, some training courses have been developed specifically for interservice use through mutual agreement of two or more services. Approximately 800 courses were used by two or more services but these represented less than 6 percent of DOD's total training. (See p. 6.)

Interservice training offers the potential for significant economies and efficiencies through better use of training facilities, equipment, and personnel. DOD policy on interservice training is set forth in Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS) Memorandum 148, dated January 24, 1964, and a joint Army, Navy, and Air Force Regulation, dated March 3, 1969.

These directives require that (1) training facilities of a military service be used to the maximum extent in meeting the requirements of the other military services and (2) duplication be eliminated or avoided when practicable.

Our preliminary work disclosed certain Air Force actions that we considered contrary to DOD policy on interservice training, which would likely increase overall training costs. We found that the Air Force had been establishing its own training capabilities instead of continuing to use existing courses of the other military services. This matter was brought to the attention of the Secretary of Defense in our interim report, "Instituting Separate Training Capabilities In the Air Force Instead Of Continuing To Use Existing Courses Of Other Military Services" (B-175773, dated May 23, 1972). We also informed the Secretary of plans to continue and expand our review of interservice training.

In response to our interim report, OSD stated that (1) a selective review of DOD interservice training would be undertaken in fiscal year 1973 and (2) the military departments would be requested to examine carefully any major contemplated detachment from the common training concept and reach more frequent agreement among themselves in accommodating new training requirements.

CHAPTER 2

INTERSERVICE USE OF TRAINING

PROGRAMS AND RESOURCES CAN BE INCREASED

Decisions involving military education and training programs and the resources necessary to support these programs should take into account DOD's total requirements for the training being considered if potential economies and efficiencies available through interservice training are to be fully realized. Before the start of our review, DOD had not aggressively promoted interservice training. Although about 6 percent of its training was conducted through interservice training arrangements, many additional opportunities were missed because training programs generally had been developed in the requirements and resources of each military service rather than in DOD.

LIMITED EFFORTS MADE TO PROMOTE INTERSERVICE TRAINING

DOD has long recognized the potential benefits of interservice training. For example, JCS Memorandum 148 issued in 1964 emphasizes that effective, efficient, and economical administration, operation, and coordination of military education and training programs can be achieved by

- promoting interservice use of existing and planned education and training courses,
- providing for the interservice exchange of information concerning education and training requirements and capabilities,
- promoting consolidation of current courses and furthering development of new courses to fulfill requirements that are common to two or more services, and
- providing for a continuing review of education and training to identify interservice requirements and capabilities in DOD.

Although the potential benefits of interservice training have been recognized, the amount of training being done on an interservice basis is small compared to the total training conducted in DOD, as shown by the table below.

Training Conducted Within DOD
During Fiscal Year 1972

	<u>Total personnel trained</u>	<u>Personnel trained on an inter- service basis</u>	<u>Percent trained on an inter- service basis</u>
Air Force	329,362	12,774	3.9
Army	407,377	32,119	7.9
Navy	494,266	12,274	2.5
Marine Corps	<u>43,527</u>	<u>17,925</u>	^a <u>41.2</u>
	<u>1,274,532</u>	<u>75,092</u>	<u>5.9</u>

^aHistorically, the Marine Corps has relied heavily on the other services, particularly the Navy, to fulfill its requirements for training. In fiscal year 1972, about 30 percent of the total Marine Corps personnel trained received their training from the Navy.

We reviewed the efforts in recent years by each service and at the JCS and OSD levels to promote maximum interservice use of training programs and resources. We found that before our review, the services had not made concerted efforts to identify training that could be made more effectively or economically on an interservice basis. The services generally had not (1) reviewed existing training courses of other services for possible duplication, (2) sought to coordinate new training or major revisions to existing training, and (3) made joint studies to determine the feasibility of adapting existing education and training programs to interservice use. The JCS memorandum and service regulations required these actions.

Moreover, JCS and OSD officials had not been involved in training decisions nor made assessments of progress by the services in implementing the JCS memorandum and service regulations. According to these officials, they have relied on the services to use interservice training to the maximum extent practicable.

POTENTIAL TO INCREASE INTERSERVICE TRAINING

To determine the opportunities for increasing interservice training in DOD, we reviewed the training being provided separately by the services for seven technical and five medical skills. Technical skills included aircraft structural mechanic, cook, baker, electrician, jet engine mechanic, machinist, and welder. Medical skills included dental specialist/technician, pharmacy specialist/technician, physician assistant, operating room specialist/technician, and X-ray specialist/technician.

We identified and compared the services' total training requirements for each selected skill, as shown by the tasks or job to be performed by personnel receiving the training. Our comparisons disclosed enough similar requirements in each of the 12 skills to indicate that interservice training could be used without impairing trainees' ability to fulfill the requirements of their respective services.

Although the degree of similarity in requirements varied, the following chart illustrates the similarity in the dental skills.

Tasks to be Performed by
Dental Specialists/Technicians

	Applicability to skill in each service		
	<u>Army</u>	<u>Navy</u>	<u>Air Force</u>
Assisting dentist in examination and treatment of patients	x	x	x
Performing dental radiographic (X-ray) procedures	x	x	x
Disinfection and sterilization of equipment and supplies	x	x	x
Care and maintenance of dental equipment and facilities	x	x	x
Preparation and maintenance of dental records	x	x	x
Counseling in preventive dentistry	x	x	x
Performing oral prophylaxes procedures	x	x	x
Providing general emergency casualty care		x	x
Requesting and issuing general supplies	x	x	
Organization and operation of field dental units	x		
Construction of athletic mouthguards			x

We developed tasks for each of the 12 selected skills in the above format, using the services' training curriculum and occupational manuals applicable to the skills. We excluded training not related specifically to the skills, such as management training.

Each service has unique requirements which necessitate special training, and we noted these in each of the 12 skills we examined. They were not significant, however, to the total training requirements and would not, in our opinion, lessen the potential for development of interservice training programs in these skills. For example, it can be seen in the above chart that dental specialists/technicians in each service were being trained to perform essentially the same tasks. The only unique tasks concerned the Army's task of organizing and operating field dental units and the Air Force's task of constructing athletic mouthguards. Only 6 hours of training were being devoted to these tasks by each service, an insignificant portion of the 503 and 637 total academic training hours provided in this skill by the Army and Air Force, respectively. (Differences in the total training hours are due to methods of conducting the training and/or proficiency levels expected of trainees.)

We believe that unique requirements can be fulfilled through interservice training arrangements provided the services are willing to accept alternative training methods. One alternative is to develop an interservice training course or program that is tailored to fulfill both common and unique training requirements. This alternative, which employs a modular concept, is being considered by the services in their current interservice training review. (See p. 11.) Another possible alternative, depending on the extent of unique requirements, would be to have each service develop a specialized course or provide on-the-job training to satisfy its unique requirements.

We noted from our review of the 12 skills that the classroom training of each service differed, sometimes significantly, in the number of training courses conducted, the specific content and length of courses, and the proficiency levels required. The extent of classroom versus on-the-job training also varied. We concluded, however, that such differences were due principally to each service acting independently in selecting the method for training, rather than to differences in requirements.

We did not attempt to measure the benefits of interservice training in any of the 12 skills reviewed. Our review was limited to determining whether the skills offered sufficient potential to warrant the services' efforts to explore more fully the precise benefits obtainable from interservice training.

Although the benefits of consolidating training in these and other skills are not yet known, the potential to achieve significant cost savings is indicated. To illustrate, the military services, in their interservice training review (see p. 10), have agreed to consolidate a portion of the machinist training now conducted separately. In this instance, the Air Force will use the Army's basic machinist training course and will eliminate its similar course. This arrangement is expected to result in a one-time savings of about \$110,900 and a recurring annual savings of about \$46,700.

Need to consider differences in classifying technical personnel

Differences in classifying technical personnel by the services conceal similarities in training requirements. These differences, therefore, should be considered to insure that the total potential for interservice training in a particular skill is not overlooked.

For example, comparing the tasks of personnel designated as electricians in each service indicated that training related to certain tasks in other services was not needed by the Air Force. This training related to the installation and maintenance of electrical power distribution systems and street and airfield lighting. The Air Force, however, had a similar requirement but was providing this training to a second person designated as an electric powerline specialist. Differences in classifying technical personnel noted in other skills we reviewed also made similar requirements for training appear unique to a particular service.

CHAPTER 3

JOINT REVIEW INITIATED TO

IDENTIFY INTERSERVICE TRAINING OPPORTUNITIES

BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES

In June 1972 the services agreed to undertake a joint review to identify duplication in training and to evaluate the feasibility of consolidating training programs and courses. The review began with a planning session followed by a series of conferences from September 1972 to June 1973. Another meeting was scheduled for early September 1973.

A steering committee and work groups comprised of personnel from the various services conducted the interservice training review. The steering committee operated under the direction of an executive committee of flag and general officers representing the principal training organizations of each service. Some major objectives of the review were to

- screen existing training courses for possible duplication,
- examine the potential for developing interservice training courses or programs in common skill areas,
- develop procedures for computing the cost benefits of interservice training arrangements, and
- promote increased interservice exchange of training technology.

REVIEW EFFORT STATUS

From the beginning of the review, representatives of each service engaged in continuous evaluations and studies of training programs and resources. The principal accomplishments and the more noteworthy actions planned or indicated are discussed below.

Some duplication in existing training courses eliminated

During the September 1972 review meeting, the work groups screened a total of 1,171 individual training courses for possible duplication. They identified 206 courses with sufficient commonality to warrant additional study for interservice use. During a November 1972 meeting, they reported that 52 of the 206 courses were sufficiently common to readily lend themselves to interservice use. Six courses were approved for immediate interservice use, eliminating a total of seven duplicate courses. The services agreed to develop plans for consolidating additional courses.

As of June 1973, the services had approved 36 individual-service-operated training courses for consolidation into 17 interservice courses. The services developed data for nine of these consolidations which showed expected one-time cost savings of about \$313,000 and an annual recurring cost savings of about \$415,000. The one-time savings included the cancellation of plans to award a contract totaling \$185,000 for constructing an auto mechanics training facility at Chanute Air Force Base, Illinois. Annual recurring savings were expected in operation, maintenance, and military pay costs.

During the June 1973 meeting, one of the work groups was assigned to develop and test specific procedures for reviewing all separate training courses and to identify courses that could be consolidated. The services hoped to complete this review by the end of calendar year 1973.

Developing interservice training programs in common skills

In November 1972 the work groups decided to study selected skills (functional areas) to determine the potential for developing interservice programs to fill the requirements of all services. Initial studies of various skills in the building and/or construction trades and in construction equipment operations indicated a potential for developing interservice training programs. Determinations regarding potential were based on a review and comparison of duty and/or job descriptions and job performance requirements, rather than on the content of existing training courses.

Before committing substantial resources to the development of new training programs, the review group decided to first develop a model program using the area of construction equipment operation. This area was selected because of the substantial similarity in tasks for all services. The specific objectives were to (1) define a proper approach to use in designing a single training program for a total skill area, (2) determine the extent to which economy and effectiveness can be achieved through a broad-based consolidation of training, and (3) provide essential information to use in developing new training programs in other common skills.

In the construction equipment operation skill, as will probably be the case in most skills, the services had some unique requirements. In developing a single training program for this skill, the review group was planning to provide for these differences by designing a common training segment plus separate segments (referred to as modules) to provide specific training on each item of equipment. Under this approach, personnel from each service would receive the common training segment plus any modules needed to fulfill their particular training needs.

In conjunction with the above model, the review group was developing single training programs for various law enforcement skills, such as dog handling and training for security purposes, police traffic management and investigations, and correctional counseling. The decision to develop these programs was made because a prior screening of individual services' training courses indicated that this training would lend itself readily to consolidation. Some initial consolidation was expected by January 1974.

Developing methods for determining cost benefits of interservice training arrangements

Under one method developed, referred to as "marginal analysis," the host service computes the additional cost, if any, it would incur to accommodate personnel of the other services in its training course, and the other services determine the savings they would realize by eliminating their courses. The potential cost benefit would be the total savings less any additional cost the host service incurred.

A permanent cost subcommittee was established to provide continuing support for all areas of the interservice training review, including continued development and application of costing methods that may be required. One of this subcommittee's more important functions is to compute the cost benefits associated with the development of any new training programs.

Efforts made to increase interservice exchange of training technology

In November 1972 the interservice training review was expanded to promote increased interservice exchange of training technology--training aids and devices, tests, manuals, and other training materials. The review group initiated work in this area on the assumption that it offered potential for dollar savings and other benefits. This assumption appears valid because of the substantial expenditures required to develop and maintain this training technology. For example, the Air Force has invested approximately \$35 million in audiovisual aids and facilities and has spent about \$7 million annually for operating costs of these audiovisual production facilities.

The services also initiated work to (1) develop common technological terminology, (2) compile an inventory of learning materials and literature, (3) identify all Government (both military and civilian) audiovisual production facilities throughout the continental United States for possible geographical consolidation, and (4) examine the feasibility of an interservice data bank for the exchange of technological information. In addition, a task force was established to coordinate the various services' educational research projects to avoid duplication of effort. Finally, the services are drafting a proposed joint regulation for interservice exchange of training literature and materials.

STEPS TAKEN TO INSURE CONTINUING THE REVIEW

The review group apparently believed that interservice training could be increased and that the resulting benefits could be substantial. The group recognized, however, that continuing the review is necessary to identify and act on additional interservice training opportunities that may exist

in DOD. We noted that some steps had been taken to insure continuing this review.

The group agreed on a need for designated personnel to monitor and coordinate, on a permanent basis, future interservice training efforts and to establish such personnel positions in each service. They anticipated that these permanent positions would expedite joint actions through improved understanding and coordination of interservice training work.

The review group also established permanent subcommittees to work in the areas of training curriculums and technology and to develop plans and procedures for the continued interservice exchange and use of training resources and capabilities within their respective areas.

OSD ROLE IN INTERSERVICE TRAINING REVIEW

OSD has been excluded from the joint meetings and has not established a role in promoting interservice training. Officials in OSD said that they planned to move slowly and would take no final actions until they saw the results of the joint review. The services have furnished periodic reports on the progress of their efforts. OSD officials were unaware of the number of people involved in the joint review or of any milestones for completing the entire review or portions of it.

When appearing before the House Armed Services Committee in support of the DOD budget for fiscal year 1974, the then-Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Reserve Affairs made the following statement:

"On the subject of military training and education, while the services will continue to have the primary role in training, there should be better monitorship of training from the Office of the Secretary of Defense than I have accomplished in the last four years, and there should be much greater emphasis upon such areas as reducing duplication of training resources between services and eliminating training in skills that are not being employed."

CHAPTER 4

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CONCLUSIONS

DOD can achieve significant economies and efficiencies by expanding its use of interservice training programs and resources. Identifying these opportunities, however, will require a continuing analysis of training programs and resources. Although the precise benefits cannot be ascertained until such an analysis is made, the fact that only a 5-percent reduction in DOD's annual training cost of over \$6 billion would amount to annual savings of over \$300 million illustrates how significant the benefits might be.

Before September 1972, DOD had not aggressively promoted interservice training. Interservice training has not been extensive up to now because each military service has been deciding unilaterally how its training requirements could best be met within the resources it has available. No assessments were made of the efforts by training commands to promote interservice training.

We consider it significant that the services have recognized and responded to the need for a comprehensive and continuing review of interservice training opportunities. Although it is too early to assess the results, the prospects for meaningful progress are encouraging because of the apparent willingness of the services to relinquish parochial interests and to join in a concerted effort to promote interservice training. The results, thus far, substantiate our belief that the benefits will be significant.

We believe OSD needs to define its role in interservice training to insure that all existing and future interservice training opportunities are identified and acted on, and the current review becomes a continuing requirement for the services. Also OSD needs to monitor this review closely to see that the willingness of the services to disregard their individual parochial interests is sustained as the review continues.

RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend that the Secretary of Defense, by directive or other appropriate means, establish an OSD role in interservice training to insure that:

- All existing and future interservice training opportunities are recognized and acted on.
- There is a continuing requirement for a joint review of training programs and resources.

We recommend also that the Secretary monitor this review closely to observe that the respective services continue their cooperative efforts.

CHAPTER 5

SCOPE OF REVIEW

We performed our review during calendar years 1972 and 1973 and conducted work at each of the services' headquarters and major commands responsible for training. We

- discussed matters relating to interservice training with responsible officials,
- reviewed existing interservice training regulations, policy statements, implementing instructions and procedures,
- examined pertinent records, reports, and statistics on the use of interservice training,
- visited various training activities in each service to examine the potential for interservice training in selected skills, and
- performed work at responsible OSD and JCS organizations to assess the efforts made at these levels to promote interservice use of training programs and resources in DOD.

After our review was underway, efforts were initiated in DOD to increase interservice use of training programs and resources. The results of these efforts have been considered, where appropriate, in our report.

A list of the activities visited during our review is listed in the appendix.

LOCATIONS VISITED

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE:

Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower and Reserve Affairs), Washington, D.C.

JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF:

Personnel Division, Washington, D.C.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY:

Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel (Schools and Education Division), Washington, D.C.

Office of the Surgeon General, Washington, D.C.

Army Training and Doctrine Command (formerly part of Continental Army Command), Fort Monroe, Virginia

Brooke Army Medical Center, Fort Sam Houston, Texas

Army Transportation School, Fort Eustis, Virginia

Army Quartermaster School, Fort Lee, Virginia

Army Engineer Training Center, Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri

Army Ordnance Center and School, Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE:

Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel (Training Programs Division), Washington, D.C.

Office of the Surgeon General, Washington, D.C.

Air Force Military Personnel Center, Randolph Air Force Base, Texas

Headquarters, Air Training Command, Randolph Air Force Base

Air Force School of Health Care Sciences, Sheppard Air Force Base, Texas

Air Force School of Applied Aerospace Science, Sheppard Air Force Base

Air Force School of Applied Aerospace Science, Chanute Air Force Base, Illinois

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY:

Office of Director, Naval Education and Training, Washington, D.C.

Navy Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, Washington, D.C.

Headquarters, Marine Corps Training and Education Branch, Washington, D.C.

APPENDIX

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY: (continued)

Chief of Naval Training, Pensacola, Florida

Chief of Naval Technical Training, Memphis (Millington),
Tennessee

Naval Air Technical Training Center, Memphis

Naval Training Center, San Diego, California

Naval Hospital Corps School, San Diego

Naval Dental Center, San Diego

Naval Schools, Construction, Port Hueneme, California

Marine Corps Service Support School, Camp Lejeune,
North Carolina

Copies of this report are available at a cost of \$1 from the U.S. General Accounting Office, Room 6417, 441 G Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20548. Orders should be accompanied by a check or money order. Please do not send cash.

When ordering a GAO report please use the B-Number, Date and Title, if available, to expedite filling your order.

Copies of GAO reports are provided without charge to Members of Congress, congressional committee staff members, Government officials, news media, college libraries, faculty members and students.

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

UNITED STATES
GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20548

OFFICIAL BUSINESS
PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE, \$300

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE



THIRD CLASS